

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Curtis Dale Richardson,	)	Civil Action No.: 4:15-cv-03317-RBH-TER
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Matt Mahon, Loris, S.C. Policeman,	)	
in his individual and official	)	
capacity; Karen Shephard, Chief of	)	
Police of Loris, S.C., in her	)	
individual and official capacity; and	)	
Officer Jeff Gore,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Curtis Dale Richardson, a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, commenced this action by filing a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the above-named Defendants alleging violations of his constitutional rights. *See* ECF No. 1. Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion seeking preliminary injunctive relief. *See* ECF No. 28. The matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (R & R) of United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, who recommends denying Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.<sup>1</sup> *See* R & R, ECF No. 64.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R & R to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge for pretrial handling.

the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No parties have filed objections to the R & R. In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199-200 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 64] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief [ECF No. 28].

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
June 2, 2016

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge